

## **CABINET**

**Monday, 19 August 2024**

Attendance:

Councillors  
Tod (Chairperson)

Cutler  
Becker  
Learney

Thompson  
Westwood

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors Porter

Members in attendance who spoke at the meeting

Councillors Bolton, Cook, Godfrey, Horrill, Langford-Smith and Lee

Other members in attendance:

Councillor Cunningham

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

---

### 1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were noted from Councillor Porter who was the Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan. Councillor Tod stated that under Article 6.6 and Part 3.2, paragraph 3 of the Council's Constitution, he would be exercising the functions delegated to Councillor Porter as the cabinet member for the purpose of this meeting.

### 2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Cutler declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of report CAB3462. He left the room during discussion of the report and took no part in any decision thereon.

Councillor Tod declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interests in respect of CAB3462 due to his role as a County Councillor.

### 3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Thirteen people spoke during public participation as summarised under consider of report CAB3462 below.

4. **LEADER AND CABINET MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements made.

5. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 19)**  
(CAB3462)

In the absence of Councillor Porter, Councillor Martin Tod, Leader of the Council, introduced the agenda item on the Local Plan Regulation 19. He outlined the Council's commitment to advancing the Local Plan, which was designed to guide development in Winchester District through to 2040. The plan, once approved, will undergo a six-week public consultation, expected to commence in the autumn. This consultation followed the Council's local development scheme timetable, which was published in August 2023. The plan includes an integrated impact assessment and a Habitats Regulations Assessment, both crucial to ensuring the plan's compliance with national and local environmental standards.

Councillor Tod emphasised the importance of today's meeting in scrutinising the updated policies within the Regulation 19 plan. He noted that these policies have been refined based on evidence gathered from previous consultations, including the Regulation 18 public consultation held in 2022. The key focus of the discussion will be on evaluating whether the proposed policies effectively address the district's strategic needs and meet the four tests of soundness as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

He also clarified the meeting's structure, noting that public representations would be addressed during the relevant sections of the discussion to ensure a thorough and manageable review of all contributions. The outcomes of this meeting would be reported to the full Council meeting on 28 August 2024, where formal approval would be sought to proceed with the consultation phase. Lastly, Councillor Tod requested that any minor corrections or cross-references in the document be forwarded to officers after the meeting to streamline the focus on substantive issues during the session.

Councillor Tod introduced the agenda item on the Local Plan Regulation 19, highlighting the critical decision facing the Cabinet to recommend the future development direction for Winchester District, excluding areas within the South Downs National Park, up to 2040. He emphasised the importance of aligning this plan with the new government's policies and intentions, acknowledging the extensive three-year process that led to this point.

The Regulation 19 Local Plan was designed to address the district's significant challenges, including affordability, climate change, nutrient pollution, and the preservation of its unique natural and historical environment. Councillor Tod noted that the plan sets out a new vision and framework for future development, with ambitious policies establishing clear standards for development. The plan includes an integrated impact assessment and a habitats regulation assessment, alongside an infrastructure delivery plan supported by a strategic transport assessment.

Once adopted, this plan will replace the current Local Plan and become the statutory development framework used alongside planning law and national guidance to evaluate the planning merits of proposals. Councillor Tod stressed the importance of this decision, which involves recommending the Council to publish the proposed Local Plan and associated assessments for public consultation.

Andrew Fraser-Urquhart KC, who has advised the Council throughout the plan preparation period, provided an overview of the legal and policy context for the Local Plan Regulation 19. The new government had published a draft amended NPPF to give effect to the priority of increasing house building. The NPPF sets out government policy and is a material consideration in the determination of all planning applications.

The draft NPPF reintroduces mandatory housing targets and has a new standard methodology for assessing those targets. The likely consequence for WCC is an increase of approximately 500 home per annum above the current provision.

Given that the current emerging local plan is based on the existing housing requirements in the NPPF, a great deal of work will be required to see how this new target in the proposed changes to the NPPF could be accommodated. This will present difficult choices for WCC in the future.

The issue today is how to accommodate this work and the timing. There are two alternatives. The first is to pause work on the existing local plan and start to consider how it would be amended to accommodate the new housing requirements in the proposed changes to the NPPF. The government suggests that if this approach is adopted the work would have to be completed within 18 months. It is entirely uncertain if this would be possible because in reality it would mean something like a complete re-write of the draft local plan and much of the evidence base. During the period of this work WCC would be without an up to date local plan and, in accordance with policy of the NPPF be required to apply a tilted planning balance when deciding any application. This would mean it would be very difficult to resist speculative applications from developers and would lead to a period of “planning by appeal” over which the council would have little control.

The second alternative is to ensure that this plan is submitted to the government for examination very quickly, before the draft NPPF is published as settled policy.

This would mean that once the Local Plan was adopted, probably early next year WCC would be required immediately to begin work on a new local plan that meets the new housing requirements. Whilst this would not avoid the need to make difficult decisions, it would enable work to be undertaken with a fresh start to logically and efficiently determine where new housing should be located. In the meantime the Council would have an up to date local plan so as to avoid the risk of “planning by appeal”.

The following members of the public and Councillors addressed the Cabinet to provide their views and concerns regarding the Local Plan Regulation 19. Each speaker raised several key points, which are summarised below:

**1. Patrick Davies:**

1. Expressed strong opposition to the proposed Local Plan, describing it as a "fictitious exercise" and a waste of time and resources and at the risk of misleading the public with the current proposals.
2. Criticised the lack of reference to recent government changes and communications from the new Secretary of State, arguing that the plan does not reflect these developments.
3. Highlighted the importance of duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities.
4. Stressed that the rush to approve the plan was an attempt to avoid making difficult choices, which would eventually have to be addressed.

**2. Councillor Maggie Hill - Colden Common Parish Council.**

1. Stated that Colden Common needs a new shop and/or a larger shop.
2. Emphasised concerns about pedestrian safety, particularly on dark and hazardous stretches of roads within the village.
3. Requested that the Parish Council be included in the design stage of developments, especially for the proposed sites in Church Lane, to ensure safe crossing points and other safety measures; confirmed that the Parish Council has previously applied for CIL.
4. Advised that there were existing issues regarding bus services, poor broadband speed and flooding.
5. Highlighted the Parish Council's willingness to work with the City Council at the design stage and requested that this collaboration be formalised.

**3. Councillor June Perrins – South Wonston Parish Council.**

1. Raised issues with the Settlement Hierarchy Review, particularly the allocation of points for employment opportunities in South Wonston, which she argued were inaccurate.
2. Suggested revisions to the scoring system that would downgrade South Wonston from an Intermediate Rural Settlement to a Smaller Rural Settlement, reflecting its lack of general employment opportunities.
3. Criticised the Integrated Impact Assessment, particularly its assessment of land at West Hill Road North (SW01), and proposed reclassifying several objectives from minor to significant negatives, citing issues like increased greenhouse gas emissions and inadequate local services such as lack of GP provision.

**4. Robert Parker**

1. Criticised the allocation process for land at Sutton Scotney, describing it as a top-down imposition without proper consultation with local residents.
2. Argued that the proposed development would geographically divide the village and create significant challenges, such as traffic issues, which had not been adequately addressed by the Council and urged Cabinet to withdraw SU01 from the plan.

**5. Councillor Pauline Mauder – Wonston Parish Council**

1. Expressed that no public consultation had taken and dissatisfaction with the late inclusion of land at Brightlands in the Local Plan, especially given the ongoing sewerage issues in Sutton Scotney which should be addressed before any development takes place.
2. Noted that Southern Water's reassurances about infrastructure improvements had not materialised in the past, raising doubts about the viability of new developments.
3. Noted that Southern Water would continue to remove waste by tankers despite assurances that this would be resolved.
4. Stressed that the Parish Council felt let down by the Local Plan team and would be responding robustly to the Regulation 19 consultation.

**6. Trevor Salter**

1. As a resident of South Wonston Mr Salter voiced concerns about the lack of feedback on representations made during the Regulation 18 consultation, particularly regarding errors in assessments and outcomes.
2. Questioned the legality of proceeding with the plan without addressing these inaccuracies and called for a review to ensure the process remained lawful.
3. Raised that there were no employment or benefits to the planned allocations.
4. Raised issues such as the lack of a surgery or health centre in South Wonston, the negative impact on air quality from increased commuting, and the potential visual intrusion of new developments.

**7. David Baldwin**

1. Supported the view that South Wonston should not be classified as an Intermediate Rural Settlement due to its lack of services and facilities.
2. Criticised the Council for not adequately addressing errors in the Integrated Impact Assessment and failing to provide comprehensive feedback to representations made during the Regulation 18 stage.
3. Raised that an additional 40 houses would put 80 additional cars on road. Private cars are the only option.
4. Expressed concern that the Local Plan was being rushed through without proper consideration of these issues, particularly in relation to the proposed greenfield site developments.
5. Stated that there were no comments on the consultation feedback pages 28 – 65.
6. Critiqued the meetings being held over the summer holiday period.

**8. Imogen Dawson**

1. Praised the ambition of the Local Plan but stressed the need for a balanced approach that adequately addressed the ongoing climate and nature crises.
2. Highlighted the importance of infrastructure, particularly water, sewage, and energy supplies, in supporting new developments, and raised concerns about the current inadequacies in these areas.
3. Suggested that small housing developments near existing services should prioritise social housing and accommodations for elderly residents to support community integration.

4. Advised that an Integrated Transport Plan was essential.
5. Called on Central Government to support infrastructure.

**9. Andrew Craig - Sport Winchester Representative**

1. Called for the Local Plan to include specific objectives and commitments for the provision of sporting facilities, citing a long-standing shortfall in such amenities across the city.
2. Expressed concern that the Local Plan did not allocate sufficient land for sports and recreational use, despite the identification of significant new parcels of land for housing and economic development.
3. Stated that the open space assessment undertaken in 2022 had a shortfall of 18 hectares. By 2040 it was considered up to 40 hectares would be needed.
4. Proposed the inclusion of existing sports facilities within new developments, such as at Sir John Moore Barracks, and recommended additional sites like Bushfield Camp be designated for sports purposes to meet community needs.

**10. Councillor Sue Wood - Sparsholt Parish Council**

1. Raised concerns about the protection of strategic gaps between communities, specifically referencing the gap between Sparsholt and Winchester.
2. Asked for clarification on when the policies protecting these strategic gaps would be confirmed and made available for community review.
3. Emphasised the importance of maintaining these gaps to prevent the merging of distinct communities, particularly in the face of new developments.

**11. Fred Schiff**

1. Questioned the validity of the site assessment for Sutton Scotney, arguing that the Integrated Impact Assessment was flawed and did not adequately consider reasonable alternative sites.
2. Criticised the limited consultation process, stating that insufficient detail was provided to the public and stakeholders, which undermined the decision-making process.
3. Supported the Parish Council's call for a proper consultation process before finalising any site allocations that would significantly impact Sutton Scotney.
4. Stated that an allocation at Brightlands would have a severing impact on the A30 and will result in noise impact from the A34.

**12. Ian Tait**

1. Supported the government's initiative to increase housing delivery and urged the Council to actively pursue large-scale social housing developments within Winchester.
2. Proposed the development of a new 21st-century council estate in Winchester, drawing on historical precedents like the Stanmore estate, to address the district's housing needs.

3. Criticised the Council for not being proactive in securing land for large housing developments and called for a change in mindset towards embracing housing growth.

### **13. Stuart Jones – Hampshire Bus Enhance Forum**

1. Acknowledged the timing issues.
2. Criticised the Local Plan for not adequately addressing public transport provision, particularly in the district's southern parishes where services have been significantly reduced.
3. Pointed out that the X9 Bus Service ceased 2 years ago.
4. Suggested improvements to transport planning for area (like Southampton Travel to work area). Also suggested improvements such as considering market towns as extended park-and-ride locations to support sustainable development.
5. Called for active consultation with parishes on bus routes and services to ensure that the Local Plan supports the needs of all areas, particularly those with reduced public transport options.
6. Supported that the Council continues conversations with suppliers such as Stagecoach and Hampshire County Council.

At the invitation of the Leader, six councillors addressed Cabinet as summarised below.

### **14. Councillor Sue Cook**

1. Expressed support for the decision to advance the Local Plan to pre-emptively address higher housing targets set by the government, but concern of adequate council resources.
2. Stressed the necessity of thoroughly reviewing and responding to all comments from the Regulation 18 consultation before the plan's submission.
3. Raised significant concerns about the adequacy of Southern Water's infrastructure, particularly relating to surface water drainage in Colden Common and the potential impacts of new developments on existing systems.
4. Emphasised the need for continued engagement with parish councils and local communities to ensure the Local Plan reflects the needs and concerns of all stakeholders.

### **15. Councillor Stephen Godfrey**

1. Accepted the logic and the decision to bring forward the Local Plan but emphasised the need to prepare for additional housing allocations potentially required by the government.
2. Criticised the plan for not making full use of available council owned land for housing, arguing that these should be prioritised to protect the countryside from unnecessary development.
3. Called for the removal of the Sutton Scotney site from the Local Plan until the infrastructure issues, particularly concerning sewage and water, are resolved; and as there has been no public consultation.
4. Stated that the council should remove the allocation SW01 and not adjust the settlement boundary.

5. Questioned the overall soundness of the Local Plan, highlighting that unresolved infrastructure issues could undermine its effectiveness and viability.
6. Emphasised the importance of ensuring that infrastructure was in place and capable of supporting new developments before they are approved.

#### **16. Councillor Danny Lee**

1. Supported the need to accelerate the programme.
2. Agreed on the necessity for a versatile and sustainable Local Plan, with a focus on environmental responsibility.
3. Highlighted the absence of an ecosystem services policy in the plan, advocating for its inclusion to ensure a balanced approach to development and environmental protection.
4. Expressed concern over the resilience and capacity of surface water and foul water drainage systems in his ward, particularly in light of new housing developments.
5. Stated Policy CN3 was crucial for net zero and asked how do we deploy the strongest argument to keep it in the plan.
6. Suggested incorporating Agri-Voltaics as a preferred method for solar energy production over traditional solar farms, promoting dual-use of agricultural land for energy generation and food production.
7. Supported policies that facilitate farm diversification and the development of a low-carbon economy, particularly in rural areas.

#### **17. Councillor Neil Bolton**

1. Highlighted the South Downs National Park Authority's poor delivery of housing targets and its implications for the district's Local Plan.
2. Asked if the Dykes farm development had progressed within the South Downs National Park?
3. Raised concerns about the assumptions made in the Local Plan's viability assessment, particularly how energy efficiency BNG and climate policies might impact housing viability.
4. Suggested holding working parties and Member briefings to scrutinise the viability of the Local Plan, ensuring it was financially sound and sustainable.
5. Reinforced Policy CN4 and the potential for water efficiency standards to be improved.
6. Questioned whether the plan's policies, particularly around net-zero carbon targets, would make new housing unaffordable for local residents.
7. Raised concerns about the potential erosion of settlement gaps due to new housing developments, particularly in areas overlapping with the South Downs National Park.

#### **18. Councillor Paula Langford-Smith**

1. Criticised the allocation of additional housing in Denmead, noting that the village had already exceeded its previous Neighbourhood Plan targets.
2. Argued that previous commitments to reduce future housing allocations due to office-to-residential conversions had not been honoured by the Council combined with the fact that this permitted development had come forward without any developer contributions.



3. Raised concerns about the pressure on local infrastructure, including inadequate sewer systems and the lack of funding for necessary upgrades.
4. Advocated for prioritising the development of brownfield sites, particularly those owned by Hampshire County Council, before considering further greenfield site allocations.
5. Emphasised that any new development should be sustainable and for example in areas like Winchester city, with a fair distribution of housing across the district, and not disproportionately affecting rural communities like Denmead.
6. Stated that for the parish council it would be important to run the Neighbourhood Plan alongside the Winchester Local Plan but that there is no budget being available for a referendum this municipal year.

#### **19. Councillor Caroline Horrill**

1. The Conservative group supported the accelerated timeline for the Local Plan to meet future housing needs but raised concerns about the process and consideration of public feedback.
2. Questioned the accuracy and transparency of housing allocations, particularly within the South Downs National Park and how these figures were determined.
3. Urged the administration to provide a clear and comprehensive response to all Regulation 18 feedback online to ensure that residents' concerns are addressed.
4. Sought clarification of the views of the administration regarding new towns and how they might respond to this within the NPPF consultation.
5. Asked officers to clarify numbers in the Carousel Park policy and whether the council intends to intensify provision at the site.
6. Asked the administration if it would stand by policy NE7 to protect settlement gaps?
7. Asked whether the council would be intensifying density at Sir John Moore Barracks site?
8. Queried why allocating greenfield sites when there is available brownfield sites in the city area.
9. Advocated for a stronger focus on developing brownfield sites owned by the Council, suggesting that these should be utilised to meet housing targets before greenfield sites are considered.
10. Raised issues about the preservation of settlement gaps and the adequacy of infrastructure to support new developments, particularly in rural areas.

Councillor Tod thanked all members of the public and Councillors for attending the meeting. These points would be responded to by officers and Cabinet accordingly during the meeting.

Cabinet considered the report and appendices in detail and officers responded to questions thereon. During discussion, the queries and comments raised during public participation and by invited councillors were also responded to. In particular, the following points were noted in relation to report CAB3462.

#### **Legal and Procurement implications**

Andrew Fraser-Urquhart KC advised that the duty to cooperate had two aspects. The first was the legal duty to cooperate with other local authorities in meeting their unmet needs. This had to be demonstrated to the Inspector at the public examination by a variable audit trail of the attempts to agree. It must be noted that this is a requirement to cooperate not a duty to agree. If it cannot be demonstrated that the duty to cooperate has been fulfilled, the plan will be unlawful without further ado and cannot be approved.

The second aspect to the duty is contained in NPPF policy on the requirement in plan making to meet the unmet need of neighbouring authorities. It is important to note that the new NPPF appears to strengthen the obligations on local authorities to meet their own needs in full and the need of others that cannot.

This is another aspect of reasons why it would be sensible to approve the plan now so that a proper opportunity is provided during the preparation of the next local plan properly to consider a potentially strengthened duty to cooperate.

### **Compatibility with the NPPF**

Councillor Tod asked about the compatibility of the plan with the NPPF consultation, in particular the consistency of the proposed approach with Annex 1 of the draft NPPF. Andrew Fraser-Urquhart KC advised that the law required the Inspector to be satisfied that the plan was in general conformity with the NPPF. The question then arises as to which NPPF as both the existing and the new draft were currently in existence. In the event the council proceeds to adopt the current plan the transitional provisions of the new NPPF would require the Inspector to consider conformity with the old NPPF. Mr Fraser-Urquhart considered that there were no concerns in this regard and the Inspector was very likely to conclude that the plan was in conformity with the old NPPF.

Mr Fraser-Urquhart continued that the transitional provisions made clear that the council would be under an obligation immediately to begin work on the new local plan. It was wrong to suggest that proceeding with this local plan would be to mislead the public. In any event there would be no difficulty in amending the introductory paragraphs of the local plan to make it clear that work will begin on a new local plan to accommodate the increased housing targets. Similarly it was wrong to suggest that the suggested process was to avoid difficult decisions as it was simply a matter of how to make those difficult decisions, whether to postpone all existing work or make a fresh start with a new local plan. The second approach was likely to be cheaper and more efficient. All the questions raised by, for example, Councillor Horrill and Mr Tait were the kind of things to be considered by the new local plan.

### **Local Plan Regulation 18 public consultation**

The Strategic Planning Manager confirmed that it was permissible for new site allocations to be introduced at the Regulation 19 stage provided the council demonstrated why sites had been introduced. This would be done when the council went out to consultation on Regulation 19.

The Strategic Planning Manager confirmed that all comments received in relation to Regulation 18 had now been published on the council's website with the final comments published the previous week. He would check the comments published in the light of comments received during public participation in relation to South Wonston.

### **Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)**

Councillor Tod asked about the role of the IIA and HRA. Mr Fraser-Urquhart KC advised that HRA was a legal requirement which deals solely with significant impacts on protected European sites. It was unlawful to have development which has a significant adverse impact on the integrity of such site or species unless there were overriding reasons in public interest to do so.

The IIA was a relatively new process. There is a legal requirement to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal of a local plan and this requirement has been subsumed within a process called IIA. The IIA was only part of the evidence base and was a fairly high level assessment using a consistent methodology which was applied across the district. It is not determinative but a tool that assists officers who make the final policy and allocation decisions. Accordingly, even if some aspects of the IIA assessment are disputed it remains a valid part of the evidence base. It was to be remembered that objectors have the ability to make representations about any aspect of the IIA both at the Regulation 19 stage and, indeed, at the local plan examination.

### **Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)**

Councillor Becker highlighted that the EIA had found that there was a small disadvantage for some people. It was noted that the council was producing a health topic paper in 2025 and that there were also positive impacts so overall the impacts balanced out.

### **Employment and Retail**

Councillor Tod noted that the requirement for Bushfield Camp allocation or equivalent was still required.

### **Strategic Transport Assessment**

The Strategic Planning Manager emphasised that the council's powers were largely limited to lobbying the county council and bus companies in this area. Mr Fraser-Urquhart KC advised that the only levers available to the council were negative in terms of preventing development coming forward unless certain provisions in terms of strategic transport were provided.

## **Meetings held with government**

The Strategic Planning Manager confirmed that various meetings had been held, including most recently with officers from MHCLG. The feedback was that they were encouraged with the council's intention to bring forward the local plan and put officers in touch with the Planning Inspector. Councillor Tod referred to a letter he and the Chief Executive had received from the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government and Deputy Prime Minister. He had also attended an online meeting held with the Deputy PM and other local authority leaders and he was confident that the council was in line with current government thinking.

## **Local Plan Planning Inspectorate (PINS) advisory service**

The Strategic Planning Manager advised that the council is in the process of agreeing a service level agreement (SLA) with PINs.

## **Biodiversity and the Natural Environment**

Councillor Learney stated that she was satisfied that the council's local plan policies fully covered the issues that the South Downs National Park policy on Ecosystem Services referred to as raised by Councillor Lee.

## **Development Allocations that are needed to meet the Development Strategy**

Councillor Tod requested further information regarding sewage issues raised in relation to the Sutton Scotney.

The Strategic Planning Manager advised that regular meetings were held with Southern Water and the council had received a letter from Southern Water outlining the work it was intended to carry out in Colden Common and Sutton Scotney. The pipeline in Sutton Scotney was under construction he was confident it would be completed before the development was phased to come forward in 2030. Mr Fraser-Urquhart KC emphasised that allocation was not the same as the grant of planning permission and permission could be refused if there were good planning reasons or conditions could be imposed.

## **South Downs National Park**

Councillor Tod highlighted that the impact of 40% of the district being within the SDNP area should be referenced in the consultation on the new NPPF.

## **Affordable housing**

The Strategic Planning Manager advised that the next iteration of the Local Plan could consider any decisions for new sites to come forwards such as sites for affordable housing Provision.

Cabinet then considered each of the policies in turn as set out in Appendix 1 and noted the main changes between the Reg 18 Local Plan and the Reg 19 Local Plan. In particular the following points were noted:

Policy CN8 – The Strategic Planning Manager provided an explanation of the new policy on embodied carbon.

Policy D9 – Cabinet noted this had been deleted.

Policies E9 and E10 – Cabinet noted that Agri-Voltaics was covered by the NPPF and the carbon neutrality policy. Mr Fraser-Urquhart KC advised that the draft NPPF included radical changes in relation to renewable energy which moved forward from the old policy regime to the extent that local authorities should approve all forms of renewable energy.

Policies NE11,12 & 13 – in relation to comments made during public participation, Cabinet noted that new sports allocations had been made in Kings Barton and North Whiteley. The Strategic Planning Manager provided further explanation regarding how sport provision came forward.

Policy H1 – the changes to housing numbers were clarified.

Policy H2 – The Strategic Planning Manager clarified the treatment of windfall sites and office to residential and confirmed the policy was applied consistently across the district.

Policy H12 to H18 – The Planning policy officer advised that the council could not demonstrate a five year supply in relation to site allocations for provision for gypsies and travellers. Consequently there would be a presumption in favour of permitting development unless the council could demonstrate adequate provision. He confirmed that the information in the table in Policy H13 was correct. There was no intention to increase intensification as part of the planning process although the Policies did allow for growth.

### **Points raised in public speaking not covered by discussion during document review.**

In response to points raised during public participation and by invited councillors, Councillor Tod provided an update on the current position regarding the council's own land assets.

Cabinet considered the IIA and HRA (as contained in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 of the report) in the light of the earlier explanation provided by Mr Fraser-Urquhart KC.

Cabinet considered the risk assessment as contained in Appendix 4 of the report.

Cabinet noted that the contents of report CAB3462 and appendices had been considered by Scrutiny Committee on 29 July 2024 and key actions arising from

that meeting, in addition to an officer response and any proposed changes were included as Appendix 5 to the report being considered today.

In relation to comments made by Councillor Horrill, Councillor Tod clarified that the government intended to establish a separate task force on proposals for new towns. Mr Fraser-Urquhart KC confirmed this topic was not mentioned in the draft NPPF.

Cabinet referred back to points raised during public participation and by invited councillors and agreed that these had all been addressed during discussion of the report and appendices as summarised above.

Councillor Tod proposed to make recommendation 5 clearer with regard to the impact of the NPPF consultation on this decision. The amendment was seconded by Councillor Learney. The following additional words were added to the end of Recommendation 5 in the cabinet report:

**....and to enable any clarification necessary to outline how the proposals are consistent with government policy and the latest consultation version of the NPPF.**

Councillor Tod thanked everyone involved in consultation and scrutiny of the report. He thanked the Strategic Planning Manager and his team for their work.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out in the report and outlined above.

**RECOMMENDED (TO COUNCIL):**

- 1. That the Winchester District Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) (Appendix 1) and the accompanying Integrated Impact Assessment (Appendix 2) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appendix 3) are approved for Publication for a period of 6 weeks anticipated to start on 29 August 2024;**
- 2. That following Publication, the Winchester District Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) and supporting documents be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination, together with the Regulation 19 representations and a summary;**
- 3. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Planning Manager in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan to prepare an addendum to the Plan that may be necessary to address soundness issues raised by representations received in response to the Regulation 19 public consultation and submit this addendum along with the Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate;**
- 4. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Planning Manager in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan to agree to any Main Modifications and to undertake a 6 week public consultation on any Main Modifications that arise out of the**

**Local Plan examination process and for this information to be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate;**

**5. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Planning Manager in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan to make any necessary editorial changes and minor amendments to the Winchester District Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19), Integrated Impact Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment, prior to Publication, Submission and during the Examination, to assist with consistency, explanation, graphic design and presentation and to enable any clarification necessary to outline how the proposals are consistent with government policy and the latest consultation version of the NPPF.**

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am and concluded at 2.05 pm

Chairperson